

*Desk*

# **THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY**

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 12 1951

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

## HUMAN RELATION PRACTICES

*Issue Editor*

*Herman H. Giles*

1. Human Relations Concept at Work *H. H. Giles* 309
2. Human Relations—A "Field of Forces"  
*Theodore Brameld* 329
3. Professional Training in Human Relations  
*Dan W. Dodson* 337
4. Toward Professional Standards  
*Ernestine Pannes* 347
5. The Forward Look *Ernest O. Melby* 361

**FEBRUARY 1951**

# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

157 WEST 13TH ST., NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

## *Editorial Staff*

E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor-in-Chief*    JOHN C. PAYNE, *Asst. Managing Editor*  
DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Editor*    EVELYN F. DODSON, *Business Manager*  
HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, STEPHEN G. RICH,  
I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, ESTHER HILTON, ETHEL ALPENFELS,  
*Associate Editors.*

## *Permanent Department*

Book Reviews

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

## *Board of Trustees*

E. GEORGE PAYNE, <i>President</i>	MAURICE MOFFATT
HERBERT D. HARPER, <i>Vice-President</i>	STEPHEN G. RICH
HENRY W. MEISSNER, <i>Secretary</i>	WILLIAM ROSENGARTEN, SR.
I. DAVID SATLOW, <i>Treasurer</i>	W. CLINTON STUART
DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Trustee</i>	

---

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, 157 West 13th St., New York 11, N. Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at the Post Office at Manchester, N. H., authorized January 16, 1950.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

tor  
ger  
CH,  
LS,

nal  
ion  
is  
10;  
be

ew  
at

tic

ole





# THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

*A Magazine of Theory and Practice*

---

Vol. 24

February 1951

No. 6

---

## FOREWORD

Toward the conclusion of the war it was apparent that want, man's oldest fear, could from a technological point of view, be eliminated from the earth. That there was no assurance that this technological know-how would ever be utilized in humanity's behalf, due to the human aspects of the problem, was equally apparent. If disaster were to be averted, it was clear that the social sciences would have to play a stellar role in these human problems and would have to be advanced rapidly. To some it was also clear that the fragmentation of the social sciences would be one of the first hurdles to be met before they could be mobilized to make their maximum contribution. The problems, many believed, were not those of sociology, psychology, anthropology, nor economics *per se*. They were first of all human problems. Where one discipline shaded into the other was, indeed, a fine line. Somehow the values of the philosopher and the data and investigative techniques of the scientists had to be matched with the arts of the educator and the skills of the practitioner in the field of social action.

Another aspect of the problem was trained personnel: How and where could professional competence be attained? It was clear that taking courses, of itself, would not assure the competencies which were needed in leadership positions. Theory had to be combined with practice, art with science, and skills with personality.

Copyright 1950, by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

It was to meet this challenge that the Center for Human Relations Studies was established at New York University. The program was designed to develop theory and practice along four lines—research, training, field work, and public information. Because of the limitations of funds the program was restricted to those phases of human conflict which seemed most pressing in our times—intergroup relations, labor relations, and interfaith conflict, although it was realized that problems such as class conflict, domestic relations, and interpersonal conflict were equally pressing.

In the February 1950 number of the *Journal* these basic approaches were spelled out in more detail. It was conceived at that time that we would use the February number this year to present the program which the Center has developed to implement these basic designs. This number is issued for that purpose.

It is gratifying that since this pioneering development was started several other projects of like or similar nature have been instituted in colleges across the country. Those at the University of Chicago, Columbia's Teachers College, and the University of Miami are outstanding examples. This record of practice is in a sense an accounting of the first three years of operation. The limitations of the Center are more those of financial resources with which to operate, than limitations of scope and design.

It is hoped that this presentation will be a contribution to human relations education, and will also point the way to big advances in all education.

DAN W. DODSON, *Editor*

## ISSUE EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

As the editor of this *Journal* has pointed out in his foreword, the present issue represents the second of a two-part series, and is an attempt to describe in some detail one incorporation of concepts offered earlier. The particular incorporation, in this case, is a graduate professional institute known as the The Center for Human Relations Studies of the School of Education at New York University. Readers of the earlier issue will remember that a broad definition of the field and its problems was followed by articles on some of the educational, psychological, sociological, and economic considerations rising from that definition. In the present issue, writers from the respective disciplines exemplify the goal of interdisciplinary staff thinking in that they each take a non-departmentalized aspect of the total enterprise for discussion. In both issues, of course, the limitations of space have resulted in a partial, but it is hoped, illuminating treatment of a vast subject.

Some further description of our present aim may be helpful. The five articles represent a consensus of staff opinion as to what should be included in introducing a current, concrete effort to institutionalize a social concept. Then, borrowing from a most provocative design which has been used in the *Journal of Social Issues*, a recognized national figure in a related field or organization has been asked to make a brief critique of each article. It is singular good fortune that we have been able to secure the particular galaxy of five, whose distinction and perspective add to the interest of this venture.

Thus, the first article, in which the staff chose to have the present writer treat the administrative and organizational framework of the Center, is reviewed by Professor Riley, who has done such outstanding administrative and organizational work in the development of the Cornell-New York State Labor-Management School in New York City.

The following three articles are on the application to a pioneer venture of the cross-disciplinary idea, the centrality of field experience, and the struggle to create professional standards. The first of these, by Theodore Brameld, is commented upon by Professor Allport, himself a pioneer in both the application of psychology to human relations problems and in the study of inter-relations among the human sciences. The second, by Dan W. Dodson, is subjected to the criticism of Superintendent Benjamin Greenberg, long a student of educational method and the administrative officer of the New York City Schools under whom the cooperative field project designated as H.R.I. and described herein is operated. The third article, by Ernestine Pannes, is subjected to the criticism of Professor Frazier, the distinguished past-president of the American Sociological Society.

The next to final word, in this number of the *Journal* is given to Dean Melby, who as one of the great educational statesmen of our time was asked to take the long view and to look into the future of human understanding and means to its achievement. The critic of this concluding statement is Professor Lippitt, internationally known for his pioneer work in action research and for long the associate of the great Kurt Lewin.

As will be seen by the reader, the five articles might be most truly described as papers on work in progress. In presenting them, there is no idea of describing great achievement, but rather to indicate the possibilities and the problems inherent in the attempt to take the great goal of democracy—the fullest growth of all—so seriously as to establish a training and research center for the development of professional competence in dealing with the undemocratic ills of society and achieving the fullest health of the body politic.

HARRY H. GILES

## **A CENTER FOR HUMAN RELATIONS STUDIES ASPECTS OF A SOCIAL CONCEPT AT WORK**

**H. H. Giles**

### **I**

To detail the history and administration of an enterprise is usually the function of an annual report—destination Files (or wastebasket). In the present instance, there may be this excuse for such an exercise, namely that: First, the Center is in some measure a social invention and an educational one as well. If Paul Mort's estimate is correct, it takes a hundred years to get a new idea into general practice in education, and the social lag is too well-known to be doubted. Next, increasingly, ever since the Center began, inquiries have come as to what it was and how it was established. Finally, there are a number of current enterprises of like or related nature with whom exchange of experience would be fruitful.

Some notes, therefore, on the process of its design and operation may be useful to both the student of social institutions, to those who contemplate similar and improved undertakings, and to contemporary pioneers who may wish to compare experiences.

### **II**

S. P. McCutchen, the social scientist, tells the story of a man who one day was talking to the Devil. He pointed to another man across the street and said, "That man has a great social concept. It is one which would provide economic security, end hate and war, and usher in a great new era of human development." "I guess that will fix your little red wagon," he said triumphantly to the Devil, "and little red hell, too," he added. The Devil smiled sardonically. He reached into the air and caught the beautiful new idea, turned it over in his hands and spoke. "Yes, it's a good



one. It could end all the infernal evil of the earth." "But," said the man, "you're not worried?" "No," the Devil said, "I'll institutionalize it."

The farmer who said he didn't want any instruction from the agricultural agent, that he was unable to do as well as he knew how already, expressed another aspect of the problem which confronts those who wish to work for full democracy through human relations studies.

When the early dreams and plans of those who established the Center for Human Relations Studies were being formulated, the dangers of static and rigid institutionalization were recognized. So, too, were the unreadiness and resistance of many people to the thought of a more scientific approach to problems of destructive human conflict.

It was, therefore, part of all the early discussions to consider how a graduate professional school could be so established as to maintain a continuous process of development and draw a new vitality to its work as it went along. In part, the problem was one of logistics—how to supply money, housing, personnel, materials. In part, it was a problem of continuous in-service education of the staff. In still larger measure than either of these, it was a problem of organizational method.

The Center which exists today is a small graduate professional school with a relatively small budget, housed in a few rooms, with a basic staff of three full-time, one half-time, one quarter-time professors, and a group of eleven consultants from a variety of fields. It serves fifty major students per year, and a few dozen others who take one or two of its courses for some orientation in the field. Its small size and its homely but homelike quarters provide a great deal of opportunity for flexible and continuous experiment in educational method. Its power depends, therefore, on the quality rather than the quantity of its resources, and its growing ability to indicate the possibilities of the field by putting ideas to the test of experience.



Mention of the history of the early ideas, some of which are now at work, may clarify the guiding ideals which animate the Center.

### HISTORY OF THE IDEA

An early dream was the establishment of an inter-collegiate, even an international, center. It was hoped that its physical *habitus* might be a handsome building, possibly including or adjacent to an international house or residence hall, but certainly providing library, meeting rooms, work rooms, and offices. Here would be gathered a staff and student body from all the fields of thought and endeavour which are most closely concerned with the nature of man and society. Here would be not alone a complete reference library of books, pamphlets, films, and other materials, but also a growing depository of "clinical" records on the whole range of human conflict, its dynamics, and its treatment.

In the Center building, classes, interagency conferences, research teams, film production units, international committees, intra and interuniversity conferences, interdepartmental exchange, visiting students, children and adults were to be welcome.

The Center would, it was foreseen, have much to do in action as consultant and in carrying on training and research in many fields of work where an educational approach was desirable. Schools were a certain source of demand for this work. It was hoped that labor, education, business and industrial personnel training, government, social agencies, and others would see the need and would call on the Center for help.

For the benefit of those who sought degrees, such a Center would need affiliation with a university or to incorporate as a degree-granting institution. For flexible development of all non-credit work, including many kinds

of training, research, and facilitation of wide professional interchange it would be best to operate independent of any other institution.

With these considerations in mind, talks were inaugurated in 1945, with various officers of institutions. Problems of institutional relations appeared to be so vast as to require a longer time than the state of the world would allow for setting up an inter-university operation at the outset. In addition, no foundation could be discovered which would undertake a sufficient and continuing grant of funds to insure the enterprise a length of life sufficient to attract national and international participation.

On the other hand, Dean E. O. Melby of New York University School of Education saw the work as of the first importance, took part in many of the first discussions of it. The Provost of NYU believed that such an enterprise should be part in and part out of a university for the reasons given above. The faculty, the Chancellor, and the University Council gave their approval, and so a Center, with all the aims and some of the characteristics described above, was established as a unit of the New York University School of Education in the fall of 1947.

Modest funds for the first and second year of operation were assured through the Bureau for Intercultural Education, and an allocation by NYU of a generous percentage of student fees paid for courses and seminars in the Center.

An interdisciplinary staff was assembled, consisting of a specialist in intercultural education, a sociologist, a child development expert, a social philosopher, an economist, an artist and communications expert, and an anthropologist. This staff drew on consultants in many fields. A limit of fifty was set for the total student body, and two seminars were announced.

## III

**ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE IDEA****Financing**

The desert wastes of our social scene are strewn with the bones of good ideas that could not reach a financial oasis. When the writer first came to New York to encounter, among many others, the problem of Deficit Financing, he early learned the axioms of fund-raisers that money is given (a) only to those who ask for it, and (b) to people, not primarily, at least, to ideas. This recalled a frightening experience in a mid-West University where the head of a department had dismissed an important research proposal by saying: "We don't need ideas, they are a dime a dozen! What we need is money." It also squared with the experience of a foremost child development center of which the author knew, where in a few short years as achievement and influence grew great, donors and funds grew small. The center disappeared one day because the Right People didn't ask the Right Sources for money.

Fortunately, the Center for Human Relations Studies was the child of unusually enlightened parents. The Bureau for Intercultural Education with its supporters, recognized that the cost of instruction alone in a professional institute would and should be considerably greater than that of general education. It is estimated that the Center has, in fact, spent less per capita than the lowest cost per student of a medical school. (It should spend much more.) When, however, no foundation support was found to underwrite the new venture *in toto*, the Bureau pledged itself, as it has in each successive year to date, to supply a substantial share of the total budget needs. During the first two years, the Julius Rosenwald Fund guaranteed nearly one-half of this pledge, and since then, led by the example and effort of Marion Rosenwald Ascoli, a variety of small foundations, organizations, and individuals have contributed. In the current year, a new non-profit organiza-

tion, Human Relations Studies, Inc., has been formed to aid the development and financing of the Center.

On its side, New York University has apportioned a generous fraction of Center student fees toward the costs of instruction. This amount has been limited by two factors: one, that the University lacks endowment and must severely restrict its expenditures in accordance with its yearly income from fees; and, two, the initial limitation of Center enrollment to a maximum of fifty major students.

The annual budget has called for an expenditure ranging from \$38,000 to nearly \$64,000. This amount has enabled a start to be made, and only that.

An important additional source of aid has been the grant of a capital sum of \$50,000 in memory of Felix Warburg. Under the Dean of the School of Education the interest from this money is used annually for the Warburg Memorial Aware to a Center Fellow or project.

Another source of income, so far in amounts which are only a token of the possibilities, has been contract services.

Whatever the funds available, a constant and proper question is: Where does the money go and where should it go?

In the case of the NYU Center, the distribution has been as follows: 80% for regular staff; 2% for consultants; 12% for housing, materials and equipment; 6% for all else, including travel, conference, research and publication.

This allotment, it is obvious, places main, if temporary, emphasis on the training function.

On the basis of present evidence it appears desirable that a Center of this size in New York City should use a basic budget (exclusive of contract services) of \$60,000 to \$100,000.

#### **STAFF AND CURRICULUM**

In its first year there was no full-time pay for any member of the Center staff, though at least two of the seven, gave it full-time attention. In its second year, with particu-

larly strong urging from the student body, the director relinquished his other work to devote himself wholly to the Center. Since then a full-time Executive Secretary has been added.

Because of their devotion to the work, it is difficult to describe the part-time staff members as such. However, in terms of payroll, the record reads as follows:

1947-48 . . 7 *part-time*; 1948-49 . . 1 *full-time*, 10 *part-time*; 1949-50 . . 2 *full-time*, 6 *part-time*, 12 *teaching consultants*; 1950-51 . . 2 *full-time*; 11 *consultants*.

Fifteen distinct fields have been represented in the competencies of staff and consultants over these years: child development, rural education, experimental education, education sociology, philosophy, public school administration, anthropology, interpretative arts, adult education, economics, psychology, psychiatry, social economy, sociometry and socio-drama, evaluation, administration in higher education, community organization.

It has been found profitable to have not less than two and not more than five specialists working regularly together with each of the seminars and courses. In addition, consultants from other fields have been called on for one or more lectures, analyses, or discussions with each group.

In the fuller account of the teaching method given in the three next articles, it will be seen that while major seminars take names and focus from special aspects of the field (e. g. Thesis Seminar; Problems Seminar; Clinical Seminar; Practicum; Psychiatric Insights), nevertheless all of them are concerned with a vast net of inter-related and dynamic factors. The point of departure and return may be an individual thesis or a methodology: yet, the problems raised in each are likely to require broad learning, an understanding of varied situational idiosyncracies, and multiple skills for their solution.

For this reason alone (the interdisciplinary and problem-solving approach), a staff of varied competencies is essen-



tial. But there is in addition, the value which accrues both on the theoretical and the practical levels, when specialists are forced to meet the difficulty of communing and working together. Each gains insight from the other.

Attempts to achieve this latter value are also made in the staff conferences. Here the history is somewhat curious and instructive. Starting with a devotion both to the ideal of democratic administration and to the notion of "staff clinics," it was hoped and foreseen that staff meetings (usually with student representation) would be sources of continuous stimulation to the growth of the participants, especially through the working out of interdisciplinary problems, and the rigorous analysis of assumptions, hypotheses, reports on work under way, and development of program. From the clarification of differences in values and methods, and from the syntheses which could be achieved, it was hoped that the vastly complex diagnosis and educational treatment of social pathology would begin to become more scientific, more artistic, and more professional. In effect, the staff meetings were to be themselves a principal provingground of the idea that diverse disciplines should find a common ground in the theory and practice of a professional training and research institution, training for a profession which did not exist, Doctor of Social Ills, Surgeon for the Cancers of Democracy!

The staff found that the walls dividing the disciplines did not crumble at the first blasts of the assorted Joshuas. In addition, there proved to be a tendency to fill the all-too-short time for staff conference with endless, often brilliant and sometimes violent, discussion of petty administrative detail.

Time has provided a constant diminution, clarification, and acceptance of difference, however. Wisdom has been gained to the extent of delegating (always with the right of review) the great bulk of administrative business to the titular administrators or an ad hoc representative.



It is not easy to contain a group of high-powered experts within any program, much less a time limit. As experience and acquaintance have ripened, however, so too has the richness, depth and concentration of staff discussion. The practice of pre-planning agenda, of cooperative determination of how time and emphasis shall be placed is part of the development that has occurred. And as the philosophic values, the problems of theory and practice have been discussed, the perspective and balance of group participation have magically increased.

### **STUDENT ASSOCIATES**

A principal problem for any graduate school is to attract, then select, the most desirable student body. In Mrs. Pannes' article, following, considerable attention is given to this subject. In the presentation of the over-all job of administration and organization it will suffice to make the following points:

First, that lacking the opportunity to provide substantial fellowships and scholarship aid, the enrollment in the beginning years must of necessity be dependent on personal contact of prospective students and staff, on recommendations of faculty members and others who know something of the enterprise and are in a counselling position, and on chance. The NYU Center, on the whole, has been fortunate in the workings of all three of these factors. However, it would like to step up the operation of the first two and step down the incidence of the third. A saving circumstance has been, of course, the opportunity to make some selection and elimination.

Second, the relation of professional placement and success of graduates and students in such a center must, in the long run, have a determining effect on both the quantity and the quality of candidates for enrollment. In this connection, since the term Human Relations Studies is so new and the competencies it offers so little known, the Center has sought to encourage administrators to specify their

needs and requirements. In the summer before the Center opened, a meeting of three dozen such employers was held in order to start discussion of possible requirements and since then the Center staff on numerous occasions has raised the question in a variety of professional agency conferences.

Third, the situation of the NYU Center is fortunate in that key personnel in a great variety of national agencies are stationed in New York City. The number of such persons who have enrolled in the Center is encouraging. In addition, the character of New York University as a People's University has been an aid. Students of every ethnic group, however defined, are served by it. For those who must study part-time, again the University provides easy access with its schedule of late afternoon and evening classes.

Finally, however, the optimum attractive and selective process would be a more national and even international process, and one in which at least the ratio common to medical schools (though not their basis of academic standing) would operate in selection and rejection. It is hoped that this issue of the *Journal of Educational Sociology* will in itself be one means of better informing many who may help us in finding the most and the best candidates for admission.

#### **INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS**

According to the initial premise, the work of the Center was to benefit by the use of ideas and personnel from many departments and they, in turn, would, it was hoped, find in the Center ideas and practices useful to them. This aim was to be achieved in some measure by the employment in the Center of part-time teachers from different departments and by their participation in both Center and departmental meetings. There were in addition many other media of exchange. One of the most important of these was the very process of establishing the new enterprise.

A year prior to the inauguration of the Center, Dean Melby selected Professor Alice Keliher of the School of Education to conduct all preliminary negotiations with the faculty. Representing both the School and the Bureau for Intercultural Education, Professor Keliher consulted with department heads and other individual members of the faculty, with the appropriate committees, and prepared the initial recommendation for faculty and administrative action which was approved, virtually unchanged, but not until extensive discussion had taken place. In the course of these discussions it was apparent, as it has been ever since, that many and influential members of the faculty saw the new Center as but a further incorporation of a basic social and educational point of view to which they had been long and deeply committed.

It is a striking fact that on the whole departments have gone out of their way to aid the infant effort, which it would have been easy for them to view with distrust. They have seen it as a complementary rather than as a competitive part of the larger institutional structure. In 1949-50, when a principal donor asked for reactions from the deans and departmental chairmen, twenty-three out of thirty-one responded with approval of the Center and its aims.

The picture is not all sunlight and roses, however. Although the support of the deans and the department heads has been generally, and in a large number of cases overwhelmingly, favorable there are as yet unsolved and vexing problems of which all are aware. Some of these have to do with the lack of funds mentioned earlier to employ more part-time participants (for a year or two each) from a wider range of disciplines. Another is money to support theoretical and action research bearing on human relations but carried on under the aegis of many departments. Another is wider service to departments by Center specialists in the form of lectures, discussions, visual aids, consultation, and conferences.

In the current year, a token effort in this later direction is being made by offering lecturers and panels from the Center to interested professors who want to introduce their classes, through at least one session, to the thinking and practice of the Center. Professors in four departments have used this service in the first three months it has been offered.

Departments holding professional conferences have made increasing use of Center staff and student associates, and from time to time, the deans, department heads, and others take part in Center conferences.

Two particularly close and fruitful associations have been gratifying and productive. One of these is with the Center for Field Services, which organizes extension courses. The other is with the Professor of International Relations, who is also head of Interdepartmental work in the school. With the former, the Center has been able to plan and staff in-service teacher and citizen courses in the field. With the latter, joint aid and planning have most recently resulted in a proposal for a summer Workshop on Human Relations in World Affairs, which will, in July and August of 1951, hold its sessions in France, Germany, and England.

### RESEARCH

Though the whole way of work at the Center is experimental in a broad sense, though extensive records are kept, and though individual students have done significant doctoral studies in Human Relations, the research program has as yet, largely through financial lack, fallen far short of what has been envisioned. Since the Director of Research has dealt with this in detail in a following article, it will suffice here to mention three points that are of chief concern to the staff at present.

One of these is the formulation of an inclusive master research outline, which will aid students and faculty, working singly or in teams or on successive aspects in successive

years, to contribute to filling in the gaps which now exist in our tested knowledge of theory and technology.

The first, in a series of such outlines was developed in the second year of the Center, largely from a survey of the literature of the sciences of man in relation to past experience of the staff, most of whom have had extensive service in community organizations dealing with destructive human conflict. During the current year, Professor Dodson in cooperation with selected social agencies is working to gather definitions of problems which need research for immediate use by those agencies.

A second point whose importance has been increasingly recognized by the Center is the need for a comprehensive effort to re-define goals and create new designs and new techniques for research which will be consonant with "field" thinking rather than Aristotelian atomism, and which will fit the actualities of social phenomena more honestly and accurately than some traditional methods. This point may be illustrated by the tendency to force social investigations into patterns borrowed from physical science. Some such effort is needed, but in addition, there is needed bold and unlimited effort to exhaust other possibilities. As Raymond Lowie has stated in his *Primitive Society*, "To strive for the ideals of another branch of knowledge (in ethnological investigation) may be positively pernicious for it can easily lead to the factitious simplification which means falsification."

A final point is the need for the collection, collation, and ready availability of all current research relevant to Human Relations Studies. This requires more than bibliographic references. It requires that manuscript as well as printed materials be gathered and usable. While the Center has made a small beginning, based on the original collection of the Bureau for Intercultural Education, it sees the need for a far more extensive effort, under the direction of trained research librarians.



**EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION**

In the haste, welter, and tension of our world, of a huge University and a bigger city, it would require considerable funds to make the voice of the Human Relations student heard as effectively as could be wished, so far as influencing current thinking is concerned. The vast resources of modern media of communication offer a most tempting opportunity to the student who believes he has something to say about the cause and cure of destructive human conflict. Yet it is immediately apparent that as the media have developed, so the need for skilled handling of them has grown, to the point where the amateur can seldom compete successfully for the attention of the audience.

This has to do with popular presentation of theory and technology in the Human Relations field. On the professional side, the established avenues of professional meetings, learned journals, and other publications are available as always.

For both types of audience, the NYU Center has relied so far chiefly on participation in meetings and work conferences. Its staff participates annually in scores of such gatherings of national, regional, state, and local organizations.

Occasionally student associates and staff have been called upon to take part in both commercial and public service radio programs. One doctoral candidate has presented as his thesis a series of training films made by excerpting sequences from Hollywood films. One staff member, Professor Montgomery, gives much of his time to experimental production of graphic materials presenting the results of work in progress. A plan has been made under the leadership of Professor Brameld for a series of volumes incorporating the relevant data from selected fields for the civic worker and educator who is concerned with human relations. The Center makes these and other efforts to disseminate its findings. Contact of Center staff with administrators in many fields is often one of the most fruitful forms of communication. Yet the exchange of information,



like the research side of its work, can only be judged to be small and inadequate in comparison with the job it can and should be doing.

#### IV

#### OTHER INCORPORATIONS OF THE HUMAN RELATIONS IDEA

Little meaning would attach to this recital of the nature and scope of an idea in action if it omitted reference, at least, to antecedent and concomitant work, the paternal and the fraternal family of ideas and their institutional expression.

The fact that in his survey Charles Johnson found in 1944 more than 1,000 "good will" organizations, and that since that date over two hundred public and private committees on race relations, unity groups and the like have formed the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials are indicative of the extent to which citizens' groups and government have responded to the challenge of achieving democratic equality of opportunity in our dissension-torn world. The social milieu, then, is one which not only favors but demands action on human relations problems.

It is all the more astonishing, in view of this demand, that so little scientific examination and professional training took account of this field, prior to six years ago. That it was little, is indicated by the dearth, almost the complete absence of trained personnel to man the mayor's committees, the almost complete absence of conscious, planned training in human relations technology in teacher education, the fact that "personnel relations" in business and industry was largely a matter of handling applications, classifications and assignments, and the fact that good will organizations were spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on untested activities, particularly speeches and pamphlets.

It is not proposed, nor is it possible to describe the historical origins or to detail all the rapidly multiplying recent developments. A few will suffice to illustrate. Some were antecedent, some parallel, some cooperative and some competing with the Center in its struggle to come into being. All together are part of the growing national and world consciousness of the extent to which social ills are man-made, are products of human thought and institutions and are, therefore, amenable to study and intelligent change.

Some antecedent forces, such as the insight of folk-lore, artists, religionists, and philosophers are as old as men's cultural heritage. The Golden Rule found in all the greatest and most ancient religions may be thought of as a principle governing technique in human relations. The new sciences of genetic biology, psychology, psychiatry, anthropology, and sociology are responsible for much of both the hope and the basic data upon which can be built a more scientific and artistic approach to the development of a democratic society.

More particularly, the productive thought of such men as John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Elton Mayo has brought into the forefront of professional thinking a belief in the growth and intelligence potential of men, the demonstrated value of field vector analysis of human relationships, and the centrality of human relations in determining the productivity of an enterprise.

Lewin was himself instrumental in the establishment in the present decade of the Group Dynamics Center at M.I.T. and the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress, for action-research. An older university enterprise, but one not based on the concept of interdisciplinary teaching and research, the Yale Institute of Human Relations should be noted, though it has had little, if any, direct contact with the movement in the field which is under consideration here, compared, for example, with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in England.

Among the Universities and colleges which have established either training, research or field work in human relations problems in the past half dozen years are the University of Chicago with its Human Development, Intergroup Education and up to this year its office of the American Council on Race Relations. Teachers' College, Columbia University has a graduate Intergroup Education program under Dr. Martin Chworowski; Harvard has established an undergraduate and a graduate training and research program in social relations under Professors Talcott Parsons and Gordon Allport; at Michigan, under Dorian Cartwright, Ronald Lippitt and others the Research Center in Group Dynamics is operating; at Rutgers University, Max Birnbaum conducts courses and studies in Intergroup Relations; and one of the oldest of the recent undergraduate programs has been carried on at the University of Miami, Florida, under Gordon Lovejoy, who has for the past year been active in preliminary work looking to establishment of human relations program in the institutions of higher learning of the state of North Carolina. Ned Hall, anthropologist, instituted courses and community surveys at the University of Denver some four years ago; The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at New York University has established a Human Relations Research Center; and research and writing in the field is being carried on by Professor Van Til and his associates at the University of Illinois.

On the training of school personnel, the summer workshop of the Bureau for Intercultural Education with aid from the National Conference of Christians and Jews was probably the first such in the field, beginning in 1939. School and school system projects in Intercultural Education developed by the Bureau under Rachel Davis DuBois, Stewart Cole, Louis Rath, and the present writer, the American Council on Education project headed by Dr. Hilda Taba and Dr. Lloyd Cook and financed by the N.C.-C.J., the joint project at White Plains and Westchester

County in which the State Commission Against Discrimination, the Bureau and local schools cooperated, the California training projects and others have played a considerable part, without doubt, in pointing the need for more development of the training and research functions, as well as contributing to the store of knowledge, skills and materials of the field. It is this growing recognition of need which has resulted during the current school year in the establishment of two new centers, one at Yale University with Dr. Louis E. Rath as chief consultants, and one at Albany Teachers College under Dr. William E. Vickery, both aided by the Bureau for Intercultural Education.

Among the short course and institute-type professional meetings, special mention should be made of the annual Institute on Race Relations at Fisk University under Dr. Charles Johnson; the Human Relations Summer Workshop at the University of Texas under Dean L. D. Has-kew; the professional conferences on natural and human resources of the Southern States Work Conference under Edgar Morphet, John Ivey and their associates.

Related programs in the labor-business-industry field are exemplified by the impressive work of the Cornell-State of New York Labor-Management School; the Intergroup Relations Training Program of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; the work of Elizabeth Buckley and Leo Nejelski as industrial relations consultants and the Western Electric and the American Telephone and Telegraph companies' program of supervisory training.

There is not space to include here the flood of learned and popular publications dealing with race relations, religious, nationality and socio-economic conflict which has poured out since 1942. The research of the American Jewish Committee, begun under Dr. Max Horkheimer and now directed by Dr. Samuel Flowerman, the formation of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry's committee on social conflict, the sessions of the World Mental Health

Congress devoted to human relations conflict, the Freedom Pamphlet series of the Anti-Defamation League, and the pioneer work of Dr. Frank Freemont-Smith of the Josiah Macy Foundation all are indicative of the serious and intensive studies which are now being undertaken by professional societies and social organizations.

## V

### **SIGNIFICANCE OF A CENTER FOR HUMAN RELATIONS STUDIES**

It is not too much to say that human relations problems are central in our world and that their solution is central to our very existence. From the preceding account illustrative of the spread of professional interest, it is clear that never before have there been such resources or such a will to apply them on the part of centers of learning and technicians in many social institutions.

It is appropriate that this country should take a part, perhaps a leading part in the development of theory and technology for dealing with destructive human conflict, since one of our strongest social commitments as a nation has been from the first, to the ideal of equal opportunity.

Whether there is time and skill enough to learn, and to apply the learning to the present world tension before it becomes an all consuming holocaust no man knows. Therefore, and with recognition that time not used is lost, it seems imperative that all who believe in the method of intelligence, the application of art and science, the long but most effective way of education in developing understanding and unity among all mankind be at their task. It is this task to which the Center for Human Relations Studies at NYU is devoted.

---

Harry H. Giles is Director of the Center for Human Relations Studies and Professor of Education of New York University.



## COMMENT

Effey Riley

### N. Y. State School of Industrial and Labor Relations

Dr. Giles' report brings out at least three immediate reactions: delight that a comprehensive statement of organization and functions of the Center is now available; concern over its administrative and financial problems; and sharp disappointment wherever there is lack of definitive description of the work in progress and planned for the day-to-day operations and the long-term program of field work and research.

To anyone entering the Center for the first time, there is an immediate awareness of an unusual atmosphere of friendliness and cooperation. This is evidenced not only in the treatment of casual visitors, but in all of the staff interrelationships. The Center has come to exemplify for some of us that "ideal" of democratic administration.

The problems of organization and financing, regardless of philosophy, are not unique in any educational undertaking. In reading the report one has the feeling that much might have been told as to when, why and where and from whom requests for assistance had been turned down, in order that the friends of the Center might help in aiding its endeavor to tap sources of revenue. Usually appeals for such undertakings must be made on specific needs with well defined plans for research and other activities. The broad possibilities within the framework of the ideals here expressed seem very great. Perhaps too much of the Center's work had been limited to human relations in interracial situations, and not extended to the many other areas of human conflict which so need their help, and which might help to bring forth the desired financial aid.

That the center is beginning to fill a real need in the educational field is amply apparent in the many requests for the total services of the group as well as the too many demands on the staff time for ad hoc service. That it may become The Center for joining all the fields of the social sciences into a greater service for an ailing world is the sincere desire of its friends.



## HUMAN RELATIONS — A "FIELD OF FORCES"

Theodore Brameld

In the February, 1950, issue of the *Journal of Educational Sociology*, a cooperative attempt was made to provide a conceptual underpinning for such an experimental institution as the Center for Human Relations Studies. One of the central concepts considered there was the "field of forces"—a term borrowed from post-Newtonian physics and widely applied in recent psychology, especially Gestalt and social psychology, but profoundly anticipated before the end of the nineteenth century by William James and others.

The "field of forces" concept challenges the traditional philosophy of science in a radical way. Instead of building the objects of nature entirely from discrete particles of matter, instead of assuming that psychological processes are constructed from separate bits of sensation, the field theory stresses the relational, the fused, the organic character of nature and man. A science such as social psychology no longer deals primarily with the individual as a unit but with the group as the unit. The individual does not thereby become less real or less important; on the contrary he becomes more so because he is more deeply understood when placed within the social spaces which shape his own character. Kurt Lewin's "topological" psychology highlights the shift: borrowing from geometry, he approaches the problems of men in terms of their "vector" patterns, rather than in terms of counting or otherwise measuring them arithmetically as separate entities.

The full significance of the concept is only beginning, however, to be grasped by or applied practically to the reorganization of education. The influence of such leaders as John Dewey, who has always insisted upon the social as indigenous to human experience, is tremendous to be sure.

Yet, to a far greater extent, the atomistic philosophy of science continues to underlie every level of theory and practice from elementary through college and adult programs. Greatest strides have been made on the elementary level, where children learn increasingly through flexible projects that embrace a variety of interacting contents and skills. But even here artificial and arbitrary divisions remain common. As for the upper levels, such divisions are almost universal: separate courses, separate departments, self-contained standards and rules so completely overshadow the occasional efforts at genuine integration that it is often difficult to discover such efforts without a great deal of search.

From its inception, the Center for Human Relations Studies has proceeded in terms of the field approach to experience and learning. The very term *relations* compels such an approach. If the issues of the human being living with other human beings are to be clarified and resolved, they must be diagnosed in the setting of the cultural environment which shapes his behavior and which he himself reshapes. Human relations, in other words, simply cannot be faced effectively by leaving its examination to specialists in one or another department cut off, much of the time, from other specialists. Every department concerned with man as a social animal is important to human relations, but its concern can be implemented only by continuous cross-fertilization with all other departments so concerned. The Center thus becomes a dramatic symbol in human relations of the "field of forces" in physics or chemistry.

The seminars conducted by the Center in its first year, 1947-1948, sought to test this theory as richly as possible. The staff consisted of a sociologist, an anthropologist, two psychologists, and a philosopher—all of whom collaborated regularly in planning the seminars and in developing a program and policy for the Center as a whole. During the second year, one seminar was conducted by two sociologists

and a philosopher, with irregular participation by an anthropologist, an art specialist, and psychologist. Another seminar was conducted by a psychologist and psychiatrist. In the third year, a different plan was followed: two seminars, concerned to develop an over-view of the field of human relations, brought in a series of consultants, usually for single sessions, under one leader—for example, a political scientist on international relations, a social psychologist on race relations, a child psychologist on family relations, a rural sociologist on farm-city relations, an urban sociologist on class relations, a consulting psychologist on youth-age relations, an anthropologist on the intra-and inter-relations of primitive cultures, a home economics expert on relations of the sexes, and still others. A third seminar, focusing on psychiatric aspects, invited a group of practicing psychiatrists to present different phases of the field as well as different theoretical viewpoints. Thus it will be seen that no two years of seminar structure and method have been identical. Each seminar has sought to learn from the failures and successes of the preceding ones. Always, however, the aim of approaching human relations by cross-disciplinary methods has been central.

It is important to stress that such collaboration is not to be compared with the "survey" type of course still popular in some colleges and universities. The goal of the seminars is not to skim the surface but to probe as deeply as time and facilities permit into problems that are close to the experience of participants themselves. In this process, every staff member contributes where he can according to his own particular competence, always with a view to clarifying each problem under inspection by bringing to bear the several disciplines relevant to it. Suppose, to take a common instance, that the problem of anti-Semitic prejudice is under inspection. The anthropologist could review the status of the Jew in terms of racial classifications; the sociologist could show the socio-economic forces at work that breed

discrimination in our culture; the social psychologist could analyze the phenomenon of frustration and aggression; the philosopher could clarify the values governing anti-Semites as compared with members of the Jewish cultural tradition. The several participants would not, of course, "take turns;" they would rather seek to contribute whenever helpful to a growing, unified interpretation of the total problem and its solution.

Where consultants are invited to share in one or another phase of the Center's work, they are often drawn from the faculty of New York University itself. The purpose here is to keep the channels between the Center and the wider institution as free-flowing as possible. Frequently, therefore, a specialist in some field—international education, say—is invited to serve on a special committee developing a research project, or to conduct an entire seminar. Thus he may become a regular staff member for a semester, or a year or two, enriching the experience of the Center before returning to his regular program. Or he may serve only for a few hours during an entire year, depending upon his own interest in or concern with a particular problem.

This interaction between the Center proper and the University is even more continuous in the utilization of special courses by graduate students. Every one of the latter widens his program to include work in such related fields as anthropology, psychology, and the arts. Thus, a certain degree of specialization is called for, and very properly. Such specialization permits more "depth" analysis than is always possible in a more horizontal approach. Yet, even here, no course is ever pursued without constant regard for its bearings upon the wider frame of reference of human relations. The latter is, as it were, the focal core, while the more specialized work is radiational from and towards the core. Each deepens and strengthens the meaning of the other.

Nor is such interaction confined within New York University. Consultants have been drawn from Columbia University, United Nations, Howard University, the labor movement, and elsewhere. Indeed, one of the most important of all manifestations of the field theory as it operates in the Center of Human Relations Studies is an insistence upon experience in the community—experience provided by drawing experts of varied background directly into the work of the Center, but, even more, by moving directly out into areas of racial, religious, economic and other spheres of tension, conflict, and allegiance. The Center has sought to demonstrate, whenever possible, that perhaps the greatest laboratory in human relations to be found anywhere in the world exists at its very doorstep: virtually every sort of cultural grouping is abundantly available, the United Nations is but a stone's throw away, and in education itself one may find a hundred different types of principle and practice of relevance to human relations. Effort to provide field experience as a key example of field theory is discussed elsewhere in this issue: doctoral research, the H.R.I. Project, the Released Time Study, are examples. Frequent invitations to staff members to serve community and school programs both locally and in other parts of the country as well as abroad are still other examples.

One final demonstration of the "field of forces" concept—in many ways the most vital of all—is an almost limitless opportunity for integrative stimulation provided by students themselves. The roster of students who have attended in the brief span of less than four years is a testimonial to the equalitarian and cosmopolitan philosophy of the Center. Not only have all three of the major races—the Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid—been represented, but so too have the Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and various Oriental religions. Many students begin their work already enriched by years of practical experience in professional human relations—some of them social workers,



others teachers and school administrators, still others labor, business and religious leaders.

Every seminar, every learning situation, seeks to benefit from this wealth of human resources. Staff members provide only a part of the total sharing that, in a real sense, is the lifepulse of the Center. Its summer workshops, conducted both in New York City and Chautauqua, New York, enable students and staff from all parts of the world to participate together for many hours daily over several weeks. But even in the regular academic year, generous participation is encouraged: typically, the seminars are cooperative learning ventures, in which staff members try to serve more as resource persons than as lecturers or traditional leaders. In the "clinical" seminars, for example, conflict situations in which students themselves have been involved are the main "subject matter" of learning. The aim is to utilize the best available scientific methods of examining and treating such situations by group therapy. This means that every participant becomes a cooperating clinician.

The "field of forces" approach to human relations is not without serious difficulties of its own. It is new. It is evolving. Sometimes it fumbles and wastes time. Sometimes it is frustrating. A particular effort to apply it may fail quite miserably. It defies a host of time-worn habits, some of them rooted in profound philosophic principles about the sciences of man. But, taken as a whole and in the long run, it works. It invites the explorer, the pioneer, to join in the rebuilding of culture-and-education. The Center for Human Relations Studies seeks to share in the truly revolutionary adventure of democracy as a cooperative enterprise.

---

Dr. Theodore Brameld is Professor of Education in the department of Philosophy and History of Education and is on the staff of the Center for Human Relations Studies of New York University School of Education.

## COMMENT

**Gordon W. Allport**

*Harvard University*

In this day and age no enlightened social scientist will question Dr. Brameld's basic contention. He holds that the proper study of mankind must not only take into account the "field of forces" in which human relations occur, but also must be pursued in a scientific "field of forces" wherein formerly isolated specialties converge.

When the intellectual history of our era is written it will be clear that the concept of "culture and personality" took hold in the United States during the 1930's; that Kurt Lewin's use of "field theory" in group dynamics had a forceful impact upon social science shortly thereafter; and that World War II clinched the movement toward interdisciplinary cooperation. A devastating war was required to weaken disciplinary boundaries, and to shake up the universities so that valuable experiments in joint teaching and in investigation could proceed—an example being the present activities of the Center for Human Relations Studies so well described by Dr. Brameld. Many universities have developed comparable enterprises under a variety of names. There are now interdisciplinary "centers," "institutes," "committees," "departments" that focus upon "human relations," "social relations," "human development," and "social science." Although each has a unique cast, all of them reflect the remarkable current revolution in the study of man's social life.

While I am an enthusiastic supporter of this movement I am acutely aware of one of its present shortcomings. I speak of a certain "thinness" in its research productions. Dr. Brameld himself, I note, praises the movement more for its teaching than for its research.

Let us glance at the illustration he employs. He says that in the study of anti-Semitism an anthropologist can speak authoritatively on the status of the Jew in terms of racial classification; that the sociologist can show the socioeconomic forces at work in bigotry; that the social psychologist adds his knowledge concerning the effects of frustration upon aggressive feelings and behavior.

All to the good. Yet each of these expert contributions stems from narrow, grubbing, specialized, disciplined-linked research! In short, our most solid knowledge (as yet) comes not from the "field of forces" approach but from the isolated specialism that Dr. Brameld deplores. I doubt that we should lightly dismiss the "time-worn habits" and biases concerning the sciences of man as he seems to do in his concluding paragraph.

To be more specific: Can the modern student trained only in the "field of forces" manner acquire the specialized skill of anthropologists, experimental psychologists, or economic sociologists? Will he, in turn, push forward the frontiers of knowledge with refined methodological tools? The experts who now cooperate in teaching are scholars who *first* were trained in their specialties. Will their present students be as competent as they in carrying out those bits of research that we are now so happily piecing together into a field theory?

I am not saying that the "field of forces" approach may not *in the long run* lead to still sounder research and still more important discoveries. But it will not do so unless we see to it that the virtues of rigorous training in method, strenuous practice in one line of conceptual thinking, and even the enthusiasm engendered by partisanship, are to some degree preserved.

## FIELD WORK AND INTERNSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN HUMAN RELATIONS

Dan W. Dodson

The problems of professional training in human relations are not dissimilar to those of other professions. In substance they include:

- (1) How to aid the student to develop competencies rather than merely amass credits?
- (2) How bring the contributions of the various disciplines to bear around focal, human problems, rather than continue the present fragmented approach of most education?
- (3) How discover the needed competencies in a new profession?
- (4) How develop an intelligent awareness of problems *before* students are told the answers? In too many instances students are fortified with answers to problems before they have ever encountered them.
- (5) How engage students in research and exploration on problems large enough to possess significance rather than the atomistic studies now undertaken?
- (6) Most learning takes place at present in settings which are static and fixed. Knowledge never exists in such a setting. It exists and is utilized in a setting which is *relational* and *processual*. How to meet this problem is one of the greater challenges to professional training.

To meet those challenges the Center for Human Relations Studies soon found that there must needs be a close relation between experience in the field and what was taking place in the Center. It was felt that only in this cru-

cible of pragmatic operation could we find the answers to the above listed problems.

### FIELD WORK

As a consequence we were able to establish a relation between seminar and field experience which allowed credit for field work to a limited amount of credit. This program was designed for two purposes:

(a) In order that those students who started programs and developed interests which could be pursued profitably in their own communities might be encouraged to do so, and receive credit for their work.

(b) We were extremely anxious that people should not discuss problems in the clinical seminars as empty academic exercises. It was our hope that those who were not in positions where they were dealing with human relations problems would be able to receive credit for field work while they were taking the seminars and encounter the human relations problems and bring them back to the seminars. Thus we would begin to meet the problems listed in number four, above. Students would find the problems and come to seminars hunting answers, rather than having the answers given them before they know what the problems are. In addition all would talk from a background of experience and thereby mutually enrich the meaning of the seminar experience.

Approximately ten percent of our students have taken advantage of this type of experience and it has paid rich educational dividends. However, there are many problems which it presents, including:

(1) Pressure from those who wish to use it as a convenient way to amass credit, while they are away from the University.

(2) The difficulty of placing students where they can be adequately supervised. If the project is independent of an agency—such as those which represent a continuation of an interest away from the campus—the responsibility of



staff to supervise the work by correspondence and infrequent conferences is great. If it is utilized as an experiment supplemental to seminars the responsibility of placing the student so supervision makes the experience meaningful is another problem.

(3) The third difficulty is that of detecting gaps in the student's range of competencies so he can be helped by skill sessions and other types of enriched programming.

### INTERNSHIP

Field work, practice teaching, independent study, and seminars never completely solve the problem of education where sensitivity to process and relationships is involved. The nearest approach to the solution of this problem is perhaps the medical internship. Even here, however, the hospital is an island in a total configuration which is the total community. A good case could be made for the thesis that the greatest lags in medicine are due to the concern with illness outside its relation to the psyche, to the social patterns of the community which often make medical treatment a preoccupation with symptoms rather than causes, and to the individualistic pattern of training which, while it produces specialized competencies, allows little room for team work in those areas where many competencies are needed in work on a given pathology.

To provide for the type of experience which includes the whole scale of relationships, the *Human Relations I* project was designed. It is a cooperative enterprise with New York City schools. In this project certain principles seemed apparent at the outset:

- (1) Human relations take place in a community setting, if not indeed a world setting. (There is never a friction between nations in the world which does not have its repercussions in New York City.) The Community at least represents the society in microcosm, and the forces involved in intergroup conflict, for instance, are as complete as it is possible to find them in such patterns as can be tackled.
- (2) The problems are "relational" i. e., intergroup conflict in a community cannot be divorced from housing, education,

ecological processes of invasion and succession, religion, recreation, health, etc.

- (3) To successfully deal with human relations problems in a community it would be necessary to utilize the competencies involved in all the disciplines, each integrated with the other.
- (4) To successfully understand a neighborhood, research projects of broad design, again involving all research competencies, would need to be brought to bear on the investigation.
- (5) College credits mean little on such a testing ground. Achievement is measured in competencies instead.
- (6) The needed competencies for a new profession are revealed through the progress of the program.

### DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The *Human Relations I* project is an undertaking with the school system of New York City in an area between 83rd Street and 110th; the Hudson River and Central Park West. It is an area served by a Junior High School (P. S. 54) and three feeder elementary schools. The project was initiated as a district-wide undertaking by the initiative of Dr. Benjamin Greenberg on approval of the central administration. The decision to locate the activities in this particular school and area was a decision of the principals of the district. The choice had the following advantages: (1) This junior high school has as its principal the chairman of the Human Relations Committee of the district, Dr. Henry Antell; (2) The area is one representing most of the human relations problems of the city, eg., Puerto Rican and Negro populations are moving into its Northeast area, social class problems are reflected in elite neighborhoods on the west (Riverside Drive) and east (Central Park West) sides with lower socio-economic groups in between; interfaith problems are revealed in the religious life of the community. In addition, the perennial problem of preserving human values in large, highly specialized social institutions in urban areas characterized by anonymity and impersonality, is one besetting this area also.

The first step in beginning the work was the creation of a joint committee of faculty from the school and interns from the Center. This assured a close liaison between the two groups and allowed for a more professional examination of problems as they arose. This group has met weekly since the beginning of the project.

The second step in approaching the area was twofold. One group of interns started a social survey of the community. The second group started interviewing teacher personnel in the school. Thus, in addition to acquiring skills, the group was able to (1) posit community problems against what the faculty saw as problems, with the outcome of greater sensitivity of all concerned for the relation between school program and social needs of the area. (2) These two activities served to introduce the project to the school and the community in what was perhaps the quickest possible way. (3) The findings of the survey also served to provide entree to the organizations and agencies, for their membership was eager to know the findings of the investigations.

As the work in the schools progressed, many types of needs began to be felt. These included (1) need for better understanding of faculty-student relationships, as seen from the student's point of view. This resulted in several exceptionally insightful sessions with a select group of potentially delinquent, indigenous leaders of the student body. What resulted was not only understanding of the local social world of the students, as seen by them, but in addition their resentment at peer groups who had been segregated into a "fast" group. In addition, the sessions were a form of group therapy in the best sense of the term. (2) Problems of discipline and morale centering around assemblies. A subcommittee worked for the major portion of the year on this problem. Their results were exceptionally good. Not only did morale improve but in addition, many helpful programs were built around better intergroup relations. (3) A third type of need was seen to be that

of translating this new insight and data into curriculum. At all levels committees are now working to develop curriculum changes incorporating these new insights. (4) A fourth type of need was readily seen to be that of opportunity for teacher growth in human relations skills. The result has been an in-service course conducted by Dr. Antell, the principal, with the assistance of the Center associates and staff.

The relations of school with the community has been another facet of the program. One of the basic assumptions of the Center group was that the community and school could not be separated in their relationship to each other. One project which seems to be evolving is a work conference on "The Community." The plethora of organizations and agencies in the area has connoted an alert, wide awake citizenry, tremendously interested in their community. One of the finer techniques of community organization, of finding ways for them to make their impact on the community without destroying their group autonomy, is now presenting itself to us.

At the middle of the second year the factors of process and relationship loom larger than ever before. For instance, the project needs much more research as a basis for social action. The data and insights needed, however, cannot be isolated from each other if they are to be of most use. Neither can they be divorced from process.

These points of view can best be illustrated by some spelling out of a needed research design.

1. One of the first researches needed is perhaps on the history of the area. The recurring phenomena found in the area cannot be understood aside from what has gone before. The significance of historical perspective in urban areas has perhaps never been fully exploited.

2. Consumer practices and their relation to different ethnic groups in the area. The juxtaposition of groups of cultural variations, coupled with rising costs of living,

places the need for insight into these factors of consumer habits into the foreground of program need.

3. Recreation factors. The variety of cultural backgrounds makes means of spending leisure of added significance.

4. In the field of psychology, skills needed range from probing the nature and content of local prejudices to problems of ethnic differences in maturation.

5. Sociological studies needed run the gamut. Some of the more pressing revolve around finding the impact of social class as a dynamic in educational and community interrelationships. Others would include analyses of conflict in areas of interfaith, youth (delinquency), competition for leadership status, etc. Surveys of housing, occupation, mobility, etc. would also be of inestimable value.

6. In the field of health the discovery of social habits producing respiratory disorders among the Puerto Ricans and heart disease in other sections would be a great guide to agency programming.

7. At the level of community organization research on the dynamics of interaction produced by the "newcomer" might help guide agencies over troublesome problems.

8. School administration problems revolving around homogeneous versus heterogeneous groupings; bilingualism, community-school relationships, evaluation where social backgrounds are so varied, suggest a few of the areas.

9. Curriculum development along the line of translation of community needs into programming, requires study.

These merely are suggestive of other problems of guidance, adult education, community planning and many other types of needed data if efforts to direct the social process are to be productive. It is not enough, however, to procure these data. Perhaps what is equally important is that they be understood in relation to each other, and that they be obtained and presented in such a way that those who have an equity in them will be carried along in the process in such a fashion as to insure that community change will



occur. Thus can be seen the skein of relationships which make professional training in human relations, if not indeed all such training, something much more than spending time studying books, as important as that is. Human problems know no barriers of academic discipline nor institutional equity. They exist in time and place, as of the moment in a context of relations and processes. How to provide situations out of which interns can experience these fundamental aspects of human dynamics and develop competencies with *which to deal* with them is the great challenge to the Center staff.

Parenthetically, it is perhaps at this point that America has fallen down in world affairs. We have ministered to the economic man, as with ECA aid; the political man, as with the promotion of our idea of political freedom, etc., what we have ignored, perhaps, are the powerful dynamics of social status, including those problems which grow out of social class and ethnic group prejudice.

To the present time during one and one-half years, the H.R.I. experience has revealed among others the following types of needed skills: They indicate, in part, the range of competencies demanded in fifteen months of a program in one community.

- (1) How to approach a human relations problem. (Who invited the consultant? Under what conditions does he assist?)
- (2) Skill in carrying the consultant's role in a conflict situation. At the level of the group the finest techniques of group therapy are needed. At the level of community the most basic skills of community organization are a must.
- (3) To find the problems of community living which are responsible for conflicts. Here the best survey techniques are involved.
- (4) How to present such data without their constituting a threat to the community. Here action, directed research and the sharpest skills of social process are involved.
- (5) How separate symptoms from causes.
- (6) How find common denominators of interest where people can work together on things which are non-controversial . . .

thereby getting to know each other in roles other than conflict roles.

- (7) How to handle intricate interagency relationships. Here group dynamic and community organization skills are useful.
- (8) How to translate data which are collected into agency program.  
Skills in communication, organization and presentation of data are needed.
- (9) How to move position of social institutions toward more efficient service to community.
- (10) How to sensitize agency personnel to problems.
- (11) How to meet problem of changing urban neighborhood? Community planning skills.
- (12) How to translate data on community backgrounds into curricula.

America is now turning the mid-point of a century which has seen her demonstrate the technological capacity to drive hunger and want, man's oldest fears, from the face of the earth. It has also seen her demonstrate that the capacity to transmit that "know-how" has also been mastered—for did we not teach youths who had never been in an airplane to fly super-fortresses across the Pacific, across lands and waters they had never heard of before with only a few months' training? Undoubtedly the problem at the core of today's problem of survival is the human part of the equation. We have substituted fear of our fellow man for our old fear of want. If there is time enough, and as Professor Giles frequently says—we must act as if there were—we believe these modest beginnings are suggestive of the re-orientation needed for leadership in the profession, so that human personality, the "pearl of great price" may more freely reach its maximum development unfettered by present limitations which relate to man's relations to his fellow man.

---

Dr. Dan W. Dodson, Editor of the *Journal of Educational Sociology*, is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Sociology and Director of Curriculum and Research in the Center for Human Relations Studies at New York University.

## COMMENT

**Benjamin B. Greenberg**

### *NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION*

"Human Relations I" is a cooperative program of the schools in the Riverside area and the New York University Center for Human Relations Studies.

Its development is the outcome of years of consideration by the supervisors and teachers of this area with the help and guidance of the personnel of the Center and of others vitally interested in human relations programs. For a year and a half the students of the Center have been closely identified with the needs of the area—the awareness of the problems of intergroup relationships and the difficulties confronting those who wish to live as effective citizens and the readiness on the part of the schools and other community agencies to utilize the tried and tested techniques that make for desirable personal and interpersonal relationships.

We have seen evidences of success in the more sensitive acceptance of human values as the fundamental goal of learning and living in school by the school personnel and in the social and personal responsibility by parents and neighbors for the fostering of a neighborhood climate in which all can live together as decent persons.

The Human Relations conception and approach has set a pattern for teacher, supervisor, and administrator training, as well as for guidance of community workers and leaders, that will eventuate in the development of educational and character building resources with realistic and effective results for youth, adolescents, and adults living in a neighborhood in our very disturbed days.

## TOWARD PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

**Ernestine Pannes**

"Why do you want a degree in human relations?" is the first question asked any student who finds his way to the door of the old grey brick house on Thirteenth Street where the Center for Human Relations Studies has its headquarters. The answers range all the way from "because it just sounds interesting," to "because I want to find an answer to the problems which are keeping men and nations from understanding each other."

From this question, the prospective student is required to satisfy the Center staff on the following points:

- (a) the strength of his interest in the professional field of human relations
- (b) the extent to which his academic and professional experience qualify him for graduate training
- (c) the stability of his personality
- (d) his plans for the application of the training he wishes to receive.

Point (a) is determined by the Center staff through personal interviews with the student and by examination of a detailed autobiography which he is required to submit. The autobiography is not a listing of chronological events, but an evaluation of the incidents and persons influencing the major decisions in the student's life.

With respect to (b), the student submits in writing the experiences in his professional life in which he has faced and dealt with problems of human relations. His academic record is evaluated by New York University's Office of Admissions, and acceptance as a graduate student is dependent upon agreement between Admissions and the Center staff.

Point (c) is determined by interviews with the Center staff and by reference to the student's associates. Letters

of inquiry are sent to the people under whom he has worked, to his colleagues, and to his subordinates with particular reference to three points: the writer's estimate of his teaching and/or professional ability, of his personal qualifications, and of his potential abilities as a professional in the field of human relations.

Point (d) is determined by written answers to the following questions: What do you personally feel are the most pressing problems in human relations? What plans have you made for application of the training you wish to have here? Why do you particularly wish to work in the Center for Human Relations Studies?

All of this does not mean that, to be accepted, a student must be a paragon of both academic and professional virtues. Some are accepted with mediocre or "out of date" academic records because their work with people or with organizations has been outstanding; some students with remarkably high grades in a narrowly limited undergraduate program are advised to take a master's degree in one of the social sciences to better prepare them for a doctorate in human relations; some are accepted for a master's degree in human relations with the advice that the doctorate should be taken in a related field of professional competence; others whose undergraduate work has been rich in the social sciences, are accepted for both graduate degrees in human relations.

The choosing of candidates for a graduate program in human relations requires the Center staff to do a more than ordinary job of selection. The staff exercises its best judgment of candidates to insure that professional advancement both of the field and of its personnel is achieved. Human relations studies as a graduate professional program is a new and growing field, and it is difficult (as in all new fields) to define and achieve the highest standards, when nothing less will do. The professional competence of each graduate has an important bearing on the accept-



ance of the program by employers and by the other professions. After four years of successes and failures, the staff now feels that a half-year's probation should be an added criterion before final acceptance for a degree in human relations.

After acceptance, a great deal of counselling is given each student. His program is planned to encompass as fully as possible the subject matter considered central to the Center's work (see Dr. Brameld's article on the cross-disciplinary approach.) For all candidates the program for either a master's or a doctorate is tailor-made, to a degree consonant with University regulations and the considerations of time, scheduling and background competencies. The University requires almost every candidate to take work in at least two of the following fields: educational sociology, educational psychology, philosophy, or history of education. The Center staff sees that the student fulfills these requirements and in addition tries to arrange courses which fill in the gaps in his undergraduate (and sometimes graduate) preparation.

New York University offers a rich and varied selection of courses; it is not a problem of finding what the student should take, but one of eliminating courses which he wants and should have in order to fit a program restricted by his time in residence. One student, for instance, found courses totalling 125 points which he felt he wanted for his doctorate; these had to be trimmed to the approximately 85 points required for his degree because of the limitations of his time and financial resources.

The student body plays an important role in the development of the field, through its own competencies and its continuing evaluation and discussion of improvements for the Center. The diversity of backgrounds from which the students come is a large factor, also, in the cooperative effort made by both students and staff toward the better definition of the field and the higher standards which both

are seeking. In the present academic year, for instance, the students come from twenty-one different fields of employment. These include school system administrators; school principals; teachers on the elementary, high school and college levels; officers of national agencies such as the Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; staff members of national youth organizations such as the YWCA, YMHA, YMCA, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts; clergymen, psychologists, social workers, business and professional people, and members of government staffs and of the United Nations.

While this diversity of professional background poses problems of integration, it is one of the strongest factors in developing a more universal approach in human relations education. As examples which may clarify the actual course requirements, the programs of two hypothetical students from two of the twenty-one fields mentioned above: education and industry, are spelled out below:

*Student X.* This student received the bachelor's degree and a teaching certificate in 1935, and taught for three years in the third grade in public schools and for three years in a private school on the same level. His summers were spent as a counsellor in a boys' camp. He lived in a metropolitan area, but was active in community organizations. He was inducted in the army in 1941, spent nine months in this country and three years overseas in the infantry. When he returned he felt that, although his chief interest still lay in teaching children, there were many things he needed to know about the alleviation of tensions in all areas so that he might help to see that today's children would not grow up to fight tomorrow's wars all over again. He entered New York University and the Center for Human Relations Studies. He had taken the basic courses in sociology and psychology as an undergraduate, but had little in philosophy. When he receives his doctorate he will have taken the following courses:

*Human Relations*

Orientation and Integration  
 Clinical Seminar  
 Problems Seminar  
 Research

*Administration & Supervision*

School and Community Interpretation in School Adm.  
 Problems of Leadership in Supervision

*Sociology*

Education as Social Control  
 Mental Hygiene and Personality Development  
 Social Anthropology

*Higher Education*

Current Problems in Teacher College Education  
 Professional Improvement of Teachers in Service

*Philosophy*

Representative Philosophies  
 Strategy for Democracy  
 Human Behavior: A Philosophical and Psychological Analysis

*General*

World Problems Before U. N. Today  
 Evaluation in Education  
 Problems of Contemporary Life Statistics

*Student Y.* This student held a bachelor's degree from a college of liberal arts and a master's degree in business administration. He is vice-president and personnel manager of an industrial concern which employs a large clerical staff as well as skilled and semi-skilled workers. He must earn the doctorate while carrying on his job. He is concerned with the problem of personal relations in the plant, not only between the management and all of the employees, but also between the office and plant staffs, between foreman and workers, and among the workers themselves. His program for the doctorate will include the following courses in human relations:

Orientation and Integration  
 Practicum  
 Clinical Seminar  
 Research

and the following general courses:

Problems in Contemporary Life  
 Mental Hygiene and Personality Development  
 The Psychology of Personality

Human Behavior: A Philosophical and  
Psychological Analysis  
Strategy for Democracy  
Social Development of the American People

Because he is a part-time student, his experience at the Center will last about three years. During this time, with the help of the Center staff, he may institute and implement human relations programs in his plant, and can himself be called upon as a resource person to deal with like projects carried on by the Center.

Although training in the field of human relations is not in a sense conventional or "historic" educationally, the graduates of the Center have found it to be an asset in their professional lives. Center students have taken positions requiring widely divergent professional capabilities; for example, one of the Center alumni is director of a recreation center for merchant seamen in Germany, one is director of an intercultural camp for underprivileged children, one is the coordinator of human relations programs in a large southern city; one is publicity director for a large hotel, one is a parole officer directing a rehabilitation program for alcoholic parolees, one is a practicing lawyer, one is a broker, one is director of the rehabilitation program for blind refugees in Germany, one is director of an orphanage in Nebraska, two are practicing ministers, one is a school superintendent, and many are teachers.

From the major courses offered in the Center, the staff expects the student to attain certain competencies. Some of these competencies are described below:

*From the orientation and integration seminar, it is expected that the student*

will have a knowledge of the basic problems involved in the interaction of individuals and groups in (a) child development and the family; (b) race, religion, and class; (c) national and international relations.

will have a knowledge of culture, of the development of personality, of the theories of assimilation of groups; of the disintegrative factors in group life, of the political philosophies, of the good and bad features of nationalism, and of the elements necessary for international cooperation.

will have examined his own social commitment, and will understand the concepts of the basic philosophy inherent in the Center's social philosophy.

will have a basic knowledge of human dynamics.

will have examined critically his own values; will know what group values are and the motivations stemming from them.

will be able to recognize prejudice, to know the causes of prejudice, to examine the techniques for handling prejudice in individual and group interaction.

will know the patterns and the history of social change; the philosophies underlying social action and the techniques and resources of social action, e.g., legislation, pressure groups, propaganda, education, community organization, the schools, the family.

will know group dynamics, the group process; the responsibilities and skills of leaders, the responsibilities and skills of group membership, the personality factors in group behavior.

will have evaluated his individual growth.

will have evaluated the resources and approaches in human relations used by the Center.

*The clinical seminar presupposes a knowledge of the material presented in orientation and integration. From this seminar it is expected that the student*

will be able to recognize the principles of human dynamics operating in any conflict situation.



will be able to separate value judgments from a true clinical analysis of any conflict situation.

will be able to ascertain the socio-economic, the psychological, the cultural elements inherent in a conflict situation.

will be able to isolate the dominant problems in a conflict situation and to determine the sub-problems and their importance.

will be able to analyze the techniques used in a situation; what worked and why—what didn't work and why.

will have acquired from the analysis of his own conflict situation and those of others presented, some ability to plan creatively for future similar situations.

will be able to recognize limitations (his own and other's) and to set realistic goals.

will have acquired skill in handling disagreements in a group.

will be able to lead a discussion group.

will know the uses of conciliation, mediation and arbitration.

will be able to evaluate his own growth and that of the group.

will have re-evaluated his own social commitment.

*The current problems seminar* provides the actual laboratory in which the principles and techniques of human relations action are put into practice by the students serving as interns. This phase of the Center's work is specifically and comprehensively outlined in Dr. Dodson's section of this journal.

*The practicum in human relations* is to be taken concurrently with the problems seminar. It was devised to give the students more knowledge of and skill in the techniques of human relations action, specifically with reference to the H.R.I. Project (described in Dr. Dodson's section). *It is expected that the student*

will know the techniques of sociodrama; will be aware of the possibilities of psychodrama and the instances when it can effectively be put into operation by an expert.

will have acquired skill in conducting conferences and meetings.

will have acquired skill in speaking, writing, making reports.

will know the information-gathering techniques of questionnaires, surveys, interviews, and the like.

will know and can use the effective means of visual presentation such as charts, maps, graphs, exhibits.

will have acquired skills in process observing, recording, note-taking, and the like.

will be able to plan and carry through specific projects for meetings, social gatherings, professional seminars.

will have analyzed and evaluated his own work and that of the group.

*The research seminar* is usually taken in the last year of residence when the student is writing his doctoral thesis. However, research is a continuing activity for both students and staff from first to last, so that principles and techniques are being used constantly. *From this seminar it is expected that the student*

has at least an acquaintance with the major research in the field of human relations.

knows and has used the basic research tools; knows and has used the basic methods of research.

has selected and applied research methods to at least one specific research project.

has produced at least one creditable research paper, not including his thesis.

is able to evaluate the on-going research of his fellow students, as well as his own.

In order to sum up, in precise form, the requirements the Center sets for its students, the following matrices of study are listed. The original list was drawn up in December 1948 by the Director of the Center; modifications and suggestions made by staff and students have since been incorporated.

*Suggested Matrices of Study—All of which the Human Relations Center Students Should Know About; In One or More Be Specialists.*

1. Personality, Self-Understanding, Clinical Psychology, Therapy, Medicine, Dynamics, Psychiatry, Mental Hygiene.
2. Institutional Curriculum and Methods:
  - a) for family and nursery school
  - b) for elementary school
  - c) for high school
  - d) for college
  - e) for adult education
  - f) for workshops
  - g) for institutes
  - h) for business and industry
  - i) for professions
3. Sociology, Sociometry, Anthropology, Social Psychology, Philosophy, Group Dynamics, Law, Economics, Political Institutions, International Relations.
4. Organizational Methods and Practices for Administrators and Supervisors; In-service training of professional workers; functions, limitations, methods of holding conference (two or more persons); costs and budgets, cooperation among agencies.
5. Field Work and Consultation:
 

Selection and approach, common principles and techniques, time and resources, formulation of immediate and long-range objectives by workers and groups; widening participation;

limits of usefulness (when to quit, how much to expect); role of the consultant in relation to administrators, laymen, professionals; divisive forces, use of prestige persons; costs and budgets, cooperation among agencies.

6. Research:

Quantitative and qualitative; formulation of hypotheses; "controlled" tests; selection of crucial issues and priorities; time and resources needed; synthesis and evaluation of previous findings, the big names in the field, costs and budgets.

7. Interpretation:

To professional audience, to popular audience. Research papers, articles, press releases, radio presentations, visual presentations, drama, panel, lecture, chairing a meeting, home and office visits, recording and evaluating.

8. Evaluation:

Personal and group evaluation; development of professional standards; special attention to character and quality of inter-relational processes in terms of growth and productiveness.

In addition to and concurrent with the formal training given the students, there are what might be called the "intangibles." Generally speaking, these are the almost indefinable elements which are part of the Center; a way of working, an atmosphere of friendliness and cooperation, an informality, an emphasis which makes human relations real and not something out of books, a close and warm relationship between students and staff, a "growing together" among students.

Part of this quality stems from the surroundings in which the Center functions. The building is a small, friendly and inviting place. The library, where seminars are held, in a high-ceilinged room with oriental rugs and comfortable chairs—like the living room of a hospitable house. There is a small lounge for conversation or committee meetings, and a kitchen which has produced everything from tea-bag tea to a dinner for 25 people.

The surroundings set the stage for the interaction between members of the Center group, which makes for growth in many directions and from many points. There is no unbridgeable chasm between staff and students; all are learning together, and learning from each other and this makes formal distances impossible. Because of the work students and staff are doing cooperatively and because of the place in which they work, the students spend many hours at the Center. Few of them come for seminars only; they bring sandwiches and meet for lunch or tea and talk in groups or committees; they work evenings, mornings and afternoons; there is usually a quiet place to study, although sometimes all available space is used for group meetings or just bull sessions. . . .but there is constant activity and, of course, constant interaction.

The carefully planned course of study, the congenial place to work and study, the emphasis on interdisciplinary teaching, the all-pervasive social commitment—with all of these, what is the Center for Human Relations Studies seeking for its students? Two things: (a) professional competence in human relations studies, and (b) a human relations approach in other professions.

---

Mrs. Pannes is Administrative Secretary at the Center of Human Relations Studies, New York University.



## COMMENT

**E. Franklin Frazier**

*HOWARD UNIVERSITY*

Although the study of "human relations" as an academic subject and a field of professional interest is new, men have always reflected upon and written about human relations. In fact, sociology has been regarded as the social science which would correct the particularism of the other social sciences and relate their findings to society. But, it appears that students who desire special instruction in the field of human relations seek a type of knowledge that is not provided by sociology. This is attributable, it appears, to the failure of sociology to provide a knowledge and understanding of human relations in the various associations, groups, and institutions that have become important in our "mass" society. It should be pointed out, however, that with the development of political sociology, industrial sociology, and sociological studies of housing, sociologists are focusing their attention upon these phases of our society. There are evidently other reasons why students seeking knowledge of "human relation" are not satisfied with the contributions of sociology. Students of "human relations" are interested in interpersonal relations and group dynamics or what has been called "microsociology." Moreover, from what Mrs. Pannes has said concerning the students seeking a knowledge of "human relations," they want to manipulate "human relations" or direct the social process at all levels—from the organization of small social groups to the integration of racial or cultural minorities into the life of the modern urban community. A field of academic and professional interest, which would undertake to give students a fundamental knowledge of the multiplicity of human relations in our society and at the same time provide them with

the techniques and skills necessary for directing the social process, would require an encyclopaedic knowledge of social life not to mention the difficulty of defining it as a field of professional interest.

Nevertheless, students from various backgrounds are demanding a scientific knowledge of human relations in concrete social situations and training in methods to deal with the problems presented by our "mass" society. Like other fields of professional interests which have arisen to meet new social problems, the new field of "human relations" faces the difficult problems of determining academic requirements and the development of techniques. The curriculum presented by Mrs. Pannes is apparently directed to the needs of teachers who want the school to perform its function as a social institution in our "mass" society. Since a choice had to be made in building up a curriculum in the vast field of "human relation," it was wise to select this phase of training in the new field. Yet it appears that in developing this new field, some provision should be made for students to have fundamental courses in the various types of "human relation," covering such subjects as human ecology and urbanism, institutional and non-institutional relationships, group dynamics, power relations, and mass communication. In concluding these brief comments, the writer should state that these criticisms are not presented as a case against the new field of "human relations," since he regards the emergence of this new field of academic and professional interest as an indication of the growing conviction that men can manipulate the social process if they have an intelligent understanding of it. These comments are offered in order to help the clarification of this new field and, in fact, to clarify his own conception of it as a special field of academic and professional interest.

## THE FORWARD LOOK

Ernest O. Melby

The current scene with regard to human relations is exceedingly complex and in many respects confusing. Research has clarified the nature of many human relations problems. We know something of the basis of prejudice and of the conditions which produce it and also the factors that are likely to lead to well-balanced personalities and wholesome and constructive individual and group relations. At the same time as we take stock of such scientific progress there is evidence to indicate that many prejudices are daily becoming more deep seated and that economic and international strains aggravate nearly every human relations problem. Perhaps most significant of all, we as a nation discover that our weaknesses in the area of human relations here at home undermine us in our relationships abroad. It may well be however, that once there is wide-spread recognition of the degree to which our treatment of minorities lowers our strength as a nation, we shall bestir ourselves to correct our errors.

Probably nothing has so shaken the thinking of the American people in the field of race relations as recent international developments. We are made strikingly aware of the fact that the white race of which some of us are members constitutes only a small minority of the population of the globe. The Korean episode with all its concomitants has shown us the extreme lack of communication between the Western and Oriental civilizations. We find ourselves in the Orient largely without allies, fighting for a cause which to us seems a matter of life and death, but, which is little understood by the masses in the East. Our response to this recognition is varied and confusing, ranging all the way from a neo-isolationism to most hopeful concepts of world government and identification of our people with the

cause of humanity everywhere. Regardless of the existing confusion there is no question but what the American people are being alerted to the importance of intergroup relations and all problems of human relations. It is therefore pertinent to ask concerning probable future developments along educational lines designed to improve human relations.

One of the most interesting and challenging results of research is the finding that feelings of insecurity on the part of children and adults tend to promote prejudice and racial antagonism. The individual who feels that he himself lacks status appears to acquire a status through looking down upon some other race or group. Probably we do not as yet understand fully the meaning of this finding. Many homes, schools, and communities have an undesirable impact on the individual child and adult. Not only do teachers occasionally treat the child so as to contribute to his insecurity but the combined total of the impact—school, playground, home, and community, is such as to give some children the feeling of not being wanted or at least having little worth as compared perhaps to some other child or group of children. At the same time the findings of research with regard to child growth and development indicate that security, affection, and freedom are the elements of environment most conducive to the growth and development of the child's intellect and total personality. Even though Western civilization has had much to say about love and even though more recent writings in the field of education and pediatrics have emphasized the importance of affection in relationships to the development of healthy personalities on the part of children, a large proportion of our children still grow up lacking the needed affection in homes, schools, and communities.

Our past teacher education has contributed to this shortage of affection in the child's school environment. Concepts of education which emphasize the training of the intellect without regard to emotional development are often

stressed in teacher education. At advanced graduate levels, particularly those leading to the doctorate and preparing for positions of leadership, the emphasis has been on abstract learning, memory, and intellectual prowess rather than on human understanding. Then, too, the exceedingly bookish character of teacher education and the relative shortage of experience on the part of teachers in training with children, school situations, and communities tends to give us teachers who think a book is more important than a boy.

Perhaps no factor contributes as definitely and viciously to undesirable human relations in school and community as undemocratic educational administration. The number of teachers who feel insecure is enormous. Constant conflict at present over teachers' salaries and other matters of teacher welfare keep the teaching staffs of many schools in a constant state of insecurity and uncertainty. Attacks on teachers because of alleged radicalism (if not Communism) unfair and uninformed criticism of public schools—all these make for insecurity on the part of the teachers, and this insecurity is transmitted to children day by day. We are thus inextricably led to the conclusion that schools alone cannot deal effectively with human relations problems. It is the total community that makes impact on the child and the adult and shapes the attitudes of both in the area of human relations.

It is the belief of the writer that the most productive area for the improvement of human relations in the future lies in making the whole community an educational enterprise. We are as yet relatively uncertain concerning the effect of many therapeutic procedures applied to existing racial and intergroup conflicts. In the main it seems to do little good to tell members of different groups that they should like each other and get along harmoniously. In some instances the activities we carry on may actually accentuate the tensions. At the same time there is increas-



ing evidence that as members of different groups in the community work together in common community endeavor they learn to know each other and suspicion, dislike, and prejudice tend to disappear. It is really very difficult to dislike a person you know well, because, if you know an individual well you are bound to know a great many good things which are likely to make you like him. In many of our urban communities and even some of the smaller cities the opportunities for joint effort on the part of representatives of different racial, political, and religious groups have lessened with the passing of the years. In some cases there is a marked tendency to develop group antagonism and attitudes of suspicion. These feelings have gone so far that in some of our larger cities there has been a tendency for teachers to organize along racial and religious lines. In the aggregate the growing centralization in our society has weakened the cement holding us together at the local community level. If democracy is to survive some means must be found for overcoming this tendency. It is probably not practical to decentralize American urban communities. It is certainly practical however to help such communities to overcome excessive fragmentation and to develop community processes which weld groups and individuals together.

It is, however, easy to be misunderstood as we discuss a community approach to education. Sometimes we think of the community school as an answer. It is an improvement as a school, but it does not necessarily produce participation on the part of the citizens of the community in the whole enterprise of making the community a better place in which to live. It may merely be a school which renders certain services for the people of the community. This is a desirable kind of service but does not necessarily give us a total community organized for educational purposes.

Similarly, there is at present a great deal of discussion of better community relations, better public relations

activities on the part of school administrators and teachers and other proposals based more or less on the idea of a sort of diplomatic process between school and community. The citizens of a typical American community are not especially interested in this process. They would like to participate in educational policy determination. They have things to contribute to the development of what they believe are sound educational policies for the community. They are not impressed when we as teachers go to them and ask them to help us with our designs on their children. It is of greatest importance therefore that if we recognize the function of programs of total community education, we understand clearly what is meant by such education and the steps which we must take to make this kind of education an effective reality.

First of all we must understand that it is the total community that educates, that it is the child's total environment which makes impact upon him and shapes him into the kind of adult citizen that he finally becomes. Secondly, we must see that the community itself and its individual citizens are likewise being shaped by the community life and process. If we recognize these things it is important that such community processes be set in motion as will help various individuals and groups to a better understanding of one another and more amicable and appreciative relationships. Generally speaking people who work together for common purposes come to understand and even like each other. Often people who disagree in creed or theory can work harmoniously together in a program of action. All our major religious groups seek rather common social ends. If the emphasis is placed on building a better community they will find much common ground and will develop considerable mutual understanding and appreciation. The same is true of racial and economic groups. We therefore need to develop conscious educational enterprise. This means every bond issue proposal, every proposal for a new city charter

or city government, every venture in city planning is an educational undertaking. It means that we shall seek those processes which give us the greatest return in broad community understanding.

A very considerable argument goes on in groups working on the improvement of human relations over the means of bringing about progress. Some believe legislation is the answer—thus advocating fair employment practice laws as enactments against discrimination. While such laws, no doubt, have their place, the soundest gains will be made through changes in the attitudes and competencies of people. This means that better human relations will come primarily through educational means. On this sound assumption teacher education must come to grips with human relations problems and give prospective teachers and teachers in service the needed attitudes and competencies. Relatively little has as yet been done on a national basis in this connection.

Those who tend toward an economic interpretation of our society usually hold that prejudices have their roots in economic injustice and that only changes in the economic system can give us a true brotherhood. This view has been dealt a severe blow in Russia where a supposedly collective economy has more and more become involved in racial antagonism. Right here at home, on the other hand, we have example after example indicating that good human relations increase production, raise profits and wages, and make for a more successful economy. The interest of industrial leaders in the problem is a hopeful sign. Capitalism is not (as Communists insist) intrinsically anti-human. It *can* be democratic and it *can* function on the basis of human values. It is reassuring to note that when it strives to serve these values it is successful. Once industry, including both employers and employees recognize the influence of good human relations in releasing productive power we shall have given a powerful dynamic to better human relations. Educational institutions should stand ready to help industry with know how, research, and cooperative efforts.

In a very curious way the trends we have discussed in this brief statement are closely related. A feeling of security on the part of individual children and adults depends on such human relationships in the home, school, and community as will give the child and the adult a sense of belonging, and opportunity for full development, and the more fully the child participates in the life of the school and community and at the same time the more fully his parents and other adults share in community processes, the more all of these individuals will develop a sense of belonging. All human beings make their greatest growth and development in an atmosphere of security, affection, and freedom. The most productive outlook in the area of human relations is that which seeks to provide these qualities of atmosphere for home, school, and community. And I believe we shall discover that they are best achieved through the processes of living. In the last analysis, all principles with regard to good human relations are significant only if they are translated into the realm of action. It is action research that we most need. We need to discover the activities and processes which enable us as children and adults to contribute most richly to the improvement of our community life and in the process to acquire an appreciation of the worth and dignity of individuals and the vast contributions made by various groups throughout society. In such a program of action and research we shall not only learn more about the difficult problems on the human relations front, but we shall be welded together in national unity and understanding.

---

Ernest O. Melby is Dean of the School of Education of New York University.

## COMMENTS

Ronald Lippitt

*University of Michigan*

Dr. Melby's diagnosis of individual and group insecurity as a source of interpersonal and intergroup hostility is confirmed from many sources of data. There seem to be three sources of this insecurity, as Dr. Melby reviews them—lack of adequate supportive affection from adults to children, lack of acceptance and opportunity to contribute within the adult community culture, and confusion, uncertainty, danger, and lack of participation in the national and international situation which impinges on the child citizen, adult citizen, and the community as a whole. Dr. Melby recommends a process of community problem solving, planned in such a way as to have educational impact on the participants. I agree. But such insights of educational leadership will remain unreality until we accept the challenge by focusing our educational research on such methodological questions as: How can local professional educators initiate successful collaboration with official and unofficial community leaders? How can a group experience of problem solving be raised to the level of self-awareness that makes it educational? How can an oft-frustrated need to belong and participate be reactivated as a basis for dynamic group formation in the "burnt-over regions" of the community population? How can channels of communication and inter-action with national and international leadership be established and maintained? Until we see these as the problems of educational research we will remain in the isolated sanctum of "having a good educational philosophy."



